DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 390 270 FL 023 462

AUTHOR Malcolm, Ian G.
TITLE Teacher Development for Bidialectal Education.
PUB DATE Apr 95
NOTE 38p.; Paper presented at an International Conference on Language in Development (2nd, Denpasar, Bali, Indonesia April 10-12, 1995).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Bidialectalism; *Bilingual Education; Change Strategies; Cultural Context; Curriculum Development; Educational Change; Educational Needs; Elementary Secondary Education; English; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; Indigenous Populations; *Language Maintenance; Language Research; Program Descriptions; Research Utilization; Standard Spoken Usage; *Teacher Education Curriculum
IDENTIFIERS Australia (Western Australia); Edith Cowan University (Australia)

ABSTRACT

A program at Edith Cowan University (Australia) to develop a teacher training curriculum supporting bidialectalism in the schools is described. Underlying principles of this approach to bidialectal education are the acceptance of Aboriginal English, creation of a bridge to standard English, and cultivation of Aboriginal ways of approaching experience and knowledge. Two course modules were developed, to be combined with others to constitute a graduate certificate in Aboriginal language studies or a major in bidialectal education. Focus here is on three aspects of the project: research on the Aboriginal English dialect spoken in the nine participating Western Australia schools; mentoring of the teachers involved, including inservice workshops on bidialectalism and bidialectal education; and modification of the university's teacher education curriculum. Appended materials include a project timeline reflecting the roles of the research team, participating teachers, and Western Australia Education Department; and forms for use by teachers in inservice courses and classroom practice. Contains 12 references. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 390 270

TEACHER DEVELOPMENT FOR BIDIALECTAL EDUCATION

Ian G. Malcolm
Edith Cowan University

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

I. G. Malcolm

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC).

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

FL023462

Paper presented to the Second International Conference on Language in Development, "Language and Communication in Development: Stakeholders' Perspectives," Bali, Indonesia, 10th-12th April, 1995

5 **BEST COPY AVAILABLE**

Bilingualism and Bidialectalism

It is almost universally the case that development has a linguistic dimension and that linguistic dimension involves learning, and learning through, a metropolitan language, usually English. In schools all over the world students are progressively introduced to some form of Standard English in their primary schooling and have to use English to access further learning in secondary school and perhaps beyond. For millions of students, then, schooling entails, and perhaps imparts, bilingualism.

There are a large number of other children in the developing world who come to school with prior experience of English, although the English they have experienced - and perhaps used daily is not the Standard English of the school. For these children their schooling entails bidialectalism. Their situation is, however, to be contrasted with that of bilingual children, for their linguistic distinctiveness has a quality of invisibility. Rather than being seen as possessors of an alternative dialect to Standard English they may be perceived as English speakers with bad habits whose linguistic state is not to be seen as comprising an extra variety but rather a low level of proficiency in the variety of English which the school recognises.

This does not happen to all bidialectal children. The phenomenon of dialect is, of course, universal, and most schools even in English speaking countries would have dialectal diversity represented among the student population and would not need to make any significant adjustment to their curriculum or teaching approaches to meet the needs of all children adequately. What is different about other situations, especially in the developing world, is that some forms of English carry at the same time marked structural and semantic dissimilarities to Standard English and strong negative evaluation in the eyes of speakers of the standard variety, who, invariably number among the power-holders in the local, as well as the international, society.

This situation occurs, in particular, in parts of the world where pidgin - or creole - derived varieties prevail and are identified with groups whose social and educational status is perceived to be relatively low. There are many such situations in the world today. As Todd (1984:4) has pointed out, there are more than 60 pidginised

varieties of English in the world, and, under processes of depidginisation and decreolisation, they are in many cases at one end of a continuum of non-standard varieties which separates them from standard English.

English pidgins and creoles have a long history, associated with hundreds of years of trading, including slave trading, colonialism, and other activities involving language contact. Two main families of pidgins developed: an Atlantic family deriving from the slave trade between West Africa and the Americas, and the Pacific family which, perhaps, dates back to China Coast Pidgin English (Todd, 1984:77), although it is likely that many pidgins developed essentially independently in different parts of the world and that their similarities may be related to linguistic universals.

My use of the term "bidialectal" in this paper will be confined hereafter to cases where the first English dialect of the students is a non-standard pidgin - or creole-derived variety.

The existence of pidgin/creole derived varieties of English in populations of students undergoing education in standard English may often go unrecognised by educational authorities, although the low educational achievement of students coming from these populations should alert them to the fact that unresolved language and communication problems are involved. Some well known attempts have been made to come to terms with such situations in mainland USA, Hawaii and the UK. The main focus of this paper will be on recent attempts to meet the needs of children of Aboriginal descent in Australia who speak a pidgin/creole derived variety known as Aboriginal English.

Educational Considerations Associated With Bidialectalism

Where bidialectalism, as I have defined it, exists in a school population the social setting will be characterised by a number of educationally relevant sociolinguistic conditions. I want to refer to six of these.

First, the first-learned dialect of the learners, which will be the non-standard one, will be associated with a strong vernacular culture in which the school and what it stands for does not participate. There may be a community sense of "ownership" associated with this variety which may lead to resistance on the part of community members to having it "colonised" by educators who may wish to bring it into use in any way in school contexts.

In the second place, and by contrast, the second-learned dialect of the learners, standard English, may be associated with situations in which the bidialectal speakers experience a loss of control over what is going on. This may be reflected in *linguistic insecurity* (Cheshire, *et al.* 1989:23, 105; Corson, 1993:115) which exhibits itself in fluctuation between standard, non-standard and hypercorrect forms on the part of the bidialectal speakers.

Thirdly, the very non-standardness of the learner's first-learned variety of English gives it a chameleon-like resistance to definition and educational application on the part of teachers. Typically, the variety has no grammar books, style manuals or dictionaries; no authorities as to what it permits apart from the speakers themselves, and these speakers may well exhibit a range of lects, overlapping at some points with standard English, at some with pidgin or creole, at some with other non-standard or non-current Englishes.

This compounds the fourth problem, which is the lack of teacher competence in the dialect. Teachers will be standard English speakers and, even if at one time they knew the non-standard dialect spoken by the children, they may have suppressed it and accepted the prevailing view that it is linguistically and socially unacceptable. Even if they want to learn it to assist them in developing a bidialectal programme they would find it extremely difficult to do so because of its lack of standardisation and codification.

Notwithstanding this, there has been, at least in the European scene, according to Edwards (1989:318) a "marked movement towards using dialect in the classroom",

following the principle underlying bilingual education that students learn best in their first learned language. This movement is, perhaps, more theoretically than practically motivated, since the practical problems of introducing a low status variety into the school as an educational medium are almost insuperable.

A sixth educationally relevant consideration is the fact that there may well be a dialectical relationship between the standard and the nonstandard dialect within a speech community, that is, that they may represent opposing social forces and operate in communicative situations to maintain such oppositions. It is therefore misleading to suggest that, because standard English carries the greater level of prestige within the community at large it is therefore aspired to as the medium of communication of the people who constitute underprivileged minorities within that community. The bidialectal speakers may well be responding to different norms according to the situation, with the overt norms of standard English prevailing in some situations and the covert norms of the non-standard dialect prevailing in others. Sato (1993) has observed that in Hawaii the steady progress of the local vernacular English (HCE) towards standard English appears to have been halted or slowed down because of the emergence of a "solidarity ideology" (p.136), which asserts the relevance and value of what creole speakers hold in common as opposed to that which is shared with members of the wider society.

Bidialectal Education and Why It Has Often Failed

It has long been recognised that, despite the many problems it poses, some form of bidialectal education is necessary to meet the needs of learners who come to school speaking a non-standard dialect of English. Bidialectal education, or the Teaching of Standard English as a Second Dialect, developed in the USA in the late '60s and early '70s as a linguistically informed approach to the teaching of speakers of what was then commonly called Black English Vernacular. Its development could be seen to be largely on the basis of an analogy of bidialectal education with bilingual education and the teaching of English to speakers of other languages. In common with the former, it recognised as fundamental the principle that children learn language best on the basis of the first-learned language. In common with the latter, it

recognised that a structural analysis of the first learned language and of the target language was needed as a foundation for an education programme.

A full description of early approaches to bidialectal education is beyond the purposes of this paper, and has been provided elsewhere (Gardiner, 1977), but the fundamental principles could be summarised as two: first, the need for the school to accept the non-standard dialect of the bidialectal child, and second, the need for the school to teach standard English systematically to non-standard dialect speakers. In line with the first principle, bidialectal education advocated that the non-standard dialect should be recognised as legitimate and drawn on by the child as a basis for his/her learning and by the teacher as a basis for his/her teaching. In line with the second principle, it was advocated that the dialect should be linguistically analysed on the basis of contrastive analysis with standard English and that standard features should be taught in a carefully sequenced way and clearly distinguished from dialect features and from learning errors.

There is little that could be objected to on the basis of these principles, yet bidialectal education has not been overwhelmingly popular or successful. The reasons for this do not relate to the fundamental principles but rather to certain other principles which were not sufficiently taken account of in early presentations of bidialectal education (see further Malcolm, 1992).

For one thing, analogies with bilingual education and with TESOL were not complete and tend to underestimate the competence in English that is possessed by non-standard dialect speakers. Speakers of standard English as a second dialect are English speakers and the extent to which they use standard English in everyday life is often constrained less by limitations of knowledge than by social and personal factors. Their English responds to competing forces of identification and differentiation within an ambiguous social setting. A contrastive analysis may well reveal many linguistic features which distinguish their non-standard dialect from standard English, but it does not show the value each of these carries in the complex linguistic ecology of the life-space of the speakers. The dialectal differences are carriers of distinctive

linguistic and social meanings which may be obliterated if the standard dialect is substituted for the non-standard.

Another fundamental issue is the place of attitudes. It is not realistic to propose a bidialectal education which assumes that teacher attitudes to the nonstandard dialect can be turned around simply by their being told to accept the dialect. Bidialectal education runs counter to fundamental assumptions which are widely shared in society and in education. Somehow it needs to address the matter of attitude change rather than simply taking it for granted.

A third problem with bidialectal education in its original formulation is that it takes too little account of the custodians of the nonstandard dialect: the community from which the nonstandard speakers come. Bidialectal education starts in the right way in that it takes the dialect seriously. It needs to do more than this: it needs to listen to what the speakers are saying, in terms of their understanding of life and the significant features of their culture. The culture of the nonstandard speakers needs to be better understood and used to inform teaching and learning approaches in classrooms with nonstandard dialect speaking students.

Two Way (or Both Ways) Education

In seeking to overcome the inadequacies of earlier approaches to bidialectal education and to take account of the principles which it did not adequately incorporate, we in the Edith Cowan University project have turned to Aboriginal communities and their spokespersons and have adopted a concept called *two way* or *both ways* education. The term, according to McConvell (1982) comes from Aboriginal English rather than standard (or 'high') English and was in use by Aboriginal spokespersons more than 20 years ago. It puts forward a give-and-take approach to education in place of the longstanding Aboriginal experience of an education which is entirely one-way and assumes that the learning which comes from the more powerful majority population is all the learning that counts. The Aboriginal leader Pincher Nyurrmiyarri is quoted by McConvell in describing it as:

> "'two-way' also in the sense of an exchange between the Europeans and the Aborigines involved...The 'two way' alternative here is based

> on the concepts of a two-way flow in reciprocity and exchange between groups." (McConvell, 1982:62).

Similarly, another Aboriginal leader, Mandawuy Yunupingu, has described a "both ways curriculum" as one in which

- " if you have control of both languages, you have *double power*
- emphasis should be put on *yolngu* [Aboriginal] language and culture so they can be transmitted to the children
- both cultures should be respected equally" (Yunupingu, 1990:5)

The concept has developed in the context of Aboriginal communities where Aboriginal languages are being maintained and where the majority of students are Aboriginal. It has, however, been taken up far more widely, as was revealed in the inquiries of the Australian House of Representatives Select Committee on Aboriginal Education, which reported that

> "the statements of Aboriginal educational needs made to the Committee almost universally grouped educational needs under two broad fundamental objectives. These objectives were that Aboriginal people be able to acquire knowledge and skills to enable them to live in a wider Australian society but also that they be able to retain their Aboriginal identity and lifestyle. These twin objectives of Aboriginal education were expressed in Aboriginal communities as the need to teach 'both ways' in schools, ie. the European way and the Aboriginal way" (Australian House of Representatives, 1985:35-36).

More than two thirds of Aboriginal students in Australia are in schools where they form a minority of the population and in 45% of schools the Aboriginal students constitute less than 10% of the student population. Most Aboriginal students attending school do not speak an Aboriginal language. If two way education is to mean anything for them it must be generalised from bilingual to bidialectal settings. This is what we have attempted to do.

Two way education as understood in our project has been education which recognises Aboriginal English and its associated culture and world view as relevant to the curriculum for all learners. This does not mean that non-Aboriginal learners will learn Aboriginal English, but it means that they will learn about it and will discover through its insights new ways of organising and approaching knowledge and experience. At the same time, all students, both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal, will

be assisted (in different ways) in using standard English for appropriate functions and in appropriate settings.

I suggested that there were two fundamental principles underlying bidialectal education as originally proposed: accepting the dialect of non-standard speakers, and systematically teaching standard English to them. The Edith Cowan University project has adopted the first of these principles, changed the second and added a third. We have changed the second principle to take the emphasis off the teaching of standard English and put it rather onto *bridging* to standard English, since the non-standard dialect speakers are already a long way towards the goal of competence in standard English and require enabling and support rather than ESL type teaching of the dialect. The third principle which we have added recognises the need to learn from Aboriginal English and its culture new ways of approaching learning. We have expressed it as "Cultivate Aboriginal ways of approaching experience and knowledge." This means reading through the distinctiveness of the dialect to the world view which informs it and recognising the validity and value of genres and speech styles which have been developed by Aboriginal English speakers. We have, then, three principles which we have organised, for ease of imparting them to teachers, as the ABC of two-way education:

A: Accept Aboriginal English
B: Bridge to standard English
C: Cultivate Aboriginal ways of approaching experience and knowledge

Language and Communication Enhancement for Two-Way Education

In Western Australia, state education comes under the control of the Education Department. In certain areas, the Education Department takes advice from committees comprised of academics, practitioners and community members. It was my membership of the State Advisory Committee on Non English Speaking Background Children which led to the idea of the project which I am about to describe. It had become clear in 1993 that teacher demand for help with Aboriginal students' English language problems had reached unprecedented levels and revealed a serious gap in their training. It was decided that the university and the Education

Department would cooperate in devising a programme of teacher development which might lead to meeting this gap on an ongoing basis.

Aboriginal education is recognised as a national priority area in Australia and we were able to apply for "National Priority (Reserve) Funding" to enable the university to develop course modules designed to meet the need which we had uncovered. Our application was successful and the project commenced at the beginning of 1994. The final report on the project is to be submitted in mid 1995.

Under terms of our funding, the end-point of the project needed to be the production of new course modules in Aboriginal English and Two Way Education at Edith Cowan University. It was decided to make these modules two units which would be able to be combined with existing units to constitute a 4-unit Graduate Certificate of Arts in Language Studies (Aboriginal) or a major in bidialectal education within the Graduate Diploma of Arts in Language Studies, both of which would be available to serving teachers by part-time study in internal or external mode.

The way in which we chose to achieve this end point was by means of an action research project with a trial group of teachers who were currently teaching Aboriginal children in widely separated parts of Western Australia.

An essential feature of this project was that it was devised and carried out collaboratively by the Edith Cowan University academics and officers of the Education Department, two of whom became members of the research team. The project has in itself constituted teacher development for the 18 participating teachers and it has, in turn, led to further teacher development for other teachers who have heard about it and sought, through the Education Department officers, access to the information and experiences gained by the trial group of teachers.

Table 1 (see Appendix) attempts to show the course of the project from its commencement until its final objectives are achieved, in a way which enables the involvement of the research team, the 18 participating teachers from 9 schools across

the state of Western Australia, and the Head Office of the Education Department to be followed. It can be seen that as the project has gained momentum the involvement of the Education Department at the highest levels has increased. The project has, we believe, led first to a change of consciousness among teachers, then to a corresponding change in practice in the administration.

The complexity of the project precludes an exhaustive analysis of all its aspects. An attempt will be made, rather, to focus on three aspects of the project which sum up its essence. These are: modelling research, mentoring teachers and modifying courses.

1. Modelling Research

The first element in the project was the modelling of research into the dialect spoken by Aboriginal children in the schools participating in the project. Although research data are in existence on the nature of the dialect of English spoken by Aboriginal children in Western Australia (see e.g., Eagleson, Kaldor and Malcolm 1982; McRae, 1995), it was decided that, in order to achieve a change of consciousness in the teachers involved, it was necessary to let them find out for themselves the logic and the elegance of the dialect over which their students had mastery. The schools chosen to participate in the project represented a variety of regions of Western Australia where it was anticipated that a stabilised variety of Aboriginal English would be spoken. We were interested in areas where Aboriginal languages or heavy creole would not be strongly present, and we wanted areas of some geographic separation so that the data gathered would reveal to the teachers both the consistency of Aboriginal English across the state and some of the regional variants.

In modelling research for the teachers we needed to provide a framework within which they would be able to work with limited time and resources to elicit and analyse speech (and, if feasible, writing) data from their students which would demonstrate to them a range of linguistic and discourse features of the dialect.

For this, we needed to develop first elicitation tools and procedures, and then analytic tools and procedures. To obtain both we turned first to the relevant research literature, then we modified practices and procedures to make them appropriate for an action research project to be undertaken by people with minimal linguistic training.

Our principal data elicitation techniques were individual and group recording sessions with children and supporting interviews with the teachers and with Aboriginal Education Workers. The children recorded individually were selected on the basis of teacher recommendation (and their own consent) as being speakers of a distinctive form of English. Table 2 (see Appendix) shows the procedure adopted in eliciting speech from individuals. After a brief warm up, the children were invited to answer 5 questions on a two-line story which they heard on tape, and then to repeat 22 sample sentences which incorporated features which dialect speakers would be predisposed to modify when repeating. The tape to which the children were responding was recorded by a standard English speaking Aboriginal child.

The group recording sessions were extremely loosely structured and, where possible, they were recorded in the absence of a teacher or team member. The members of the group would be three or four friends selected by the child recorded individually, and their speech might be about anything of common interest. Where necessary, prompts were given, inviting talk about shared experiences or narratives.

The interviews with teachers and with Aboriginal Education Workers were on the basis of a list of questions designed to elicit knowledge of and attitudes towards the children's dialect.

All 9 schools were visited by members of the research team in May 1994 and at this stage the role of the participating teachers was simply to look on (as well, of course, as to be interviewed).

The tape recorded data were taken back to the University and transcription and analysis were carried out over the next two months. Analysis was carried out on the basis of knowledge of dialect features gleaned from earlier research, though, of course, leaving room for new categories to emerge. In order to help teachers to be able to relate the linguistic features of the dialect to the processes which had brought them about over the history of language contact between Aboriginal people and white English speakers, the features were all summed up in three categories:

(1) Simplification
(2) Nativisation (or Invention)
(3) Transfer

A profile sheet was developed on which features of each kind could be entered, so that the state of the individual's dialect could be quickly summed up and compared with profiles of other children. Also, a comprehensive 14-page framework was developed to enable profiles to be developed for all the children studied in a given school, and to enable schools to be compared with one another. Table 3 (Appendix) is an individual profile form and Table 4 (Appendix) consists of extracts from a framework for a school profile.

By the time of the mid-year school holidays, all the analysis had been done and a concentrated programme of inservice training had been prepared for delivery to the teachers. Project funds covered transport and accommodation costs to enable all 18 participating teachers to come to Perth for the inservice course.

2. *Mentoring Teachers*

It was at this point that the second phase of the project, the mentoring of teachers, began. Members of the research team (consisting of two University linguists, two University Aboriginal Education specialists, two specialist curriculum staff from the Education Department and two research assistants) were attached to groups of teachers and helped them to go over the analyses

that had been made of their children's speech (and writing as well, where teachers had been able to provide samples), and to walk through the data gathering and analysis processes. From the time of the in-service course, all teachers were paired up with mentors who were going to maintain contact with them for the rest of the year and to visit their school in the final term.

An outline of the in-service programme is shown in the Appendix (Table 5). It will be seen that the first two days of the course were concerned with Aboriginal English, the next two days with Aboriginal learning and the final day was seeking to reach some finality on two way education and to end up helping the teachers to develop objectives for their ongoing research and development programme for the rest of the year.

During the Term 3, which followed the in-service course, all of the participating teachers had three work packages to complete, in preparation for the final visits of their mentors to their schools in Term 4. The first work package, called an autonomous learning package, consisted of directed readings in linguistics and Aboriginal education, together with questions requiring written answers. There were six readings in linguistics and three in curriculum for Aboriginal learners. The readings were designed to set in a wider national and international perspective the linguistic and educational input which had been provided by the in-service course.

The other work packages were, first, a "Linguistic Work Package" (shown in Table 6 in the Appendix) and then a "Two-Way Learning Work Package" (shown in Table 7 in the Appendix). The linguistic work package required the teachers to carry out action research on the model which had been given by the research team and, optionally, to go beyond it. The two-way learning work package required the teachers to carry out curriculum innovation on the basis of what they had learned about Aboriginal English and to keep careful records of how the changes had affected both themselves and the students.

Towards the beginning of Term 4, the final term of the year, the mentors returned to the schools to which they were attached and carried out a two-day in-service programme at which the participating teachers presented the results of their work on the three work packages. At this stage the participating teachers also completed an initial evaluation of the project and the team members evaluated their performance with a view to allowing them credit for relevant university units.

3. Modifying Courses

The third aspect of the project about which I shall make brief mention is that which was the long-term end point: the provision of modified courses at university to provide better for the needs of teachers working in Aboriginal education. On the basis of the experience with the pilot group of teachers, two new units, each equivalent to 45 hours of study, were developed, one in Aboriginal English and the other in Two Way Learning for Aboriginal English speakers. These units were to be made available on campus but also in external mode, to enable them to be taken by teachers working in remote areas. Provision was also made, by combining these units with appropriate existing units, to enable teachers taking them to complete a specialist award in bidialectal education for Aboriginal people, either at the level of a Graduate Certificate (4 units) or of a Graduate Diploma (8 units). Alternatively, the units may be taken as part of a Bachelor's degree in Education. Since the university requires about 18 months notice for the introduction of new courses, these programmes, though now approved, will not be able to commence until the beginning of 1996. At that point, the teachers who achieved course credits by working with us on the pilot project will be able, if they enrol in the relevant awards, to be exempted from either one or two units.

Conclusion

At the stage of the preparation of this paper the evaluation of the project is still in progress. Without preempting what will appear in the final report, we can, however note that there have been encouraging gains in teacher awareness which have led to

unforeseen initiatives on the part of teachers, not only to modify their pedagogical approaches but also to carry on the process of inservicing their peers with regard to Aboriginal English and its significance. In the long term view, not only is there a new and unique university programme in bidialectal education for teachers of Aboriginal students, but there is also a commitment on the part of the Western Australian Education Department to ongoing research and policy development recognising the needs of bidialectal students.

REFERENCES

Australian House of Representatives (1985) Aboriginal Education: Report of the House of Representatives Select Committee on Aboriginal Education. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

Cheshire, Jenny, *et al* (eds) (1989) Dialect and Education: Some European Perspectives. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Corson, David (1993) Language, Minority Eduction and Gender: Linking Social Justice and Power. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Eagleson, R.D., Kaldor, S and Malcolm, I.G. (1982) English and the Aboriginal Child. Canberra: Curriculum Development Centre.

Edwards, Viv (1989) "Dialect and education in Europe: a postscript." In Jenny Cheshire, *et al* (eds) (1989) Dialect and Education: Some European Perspectives. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Gardiner, Jennifer (1977) "Teaching standard English as a second dialect to speakers of Aboriginal English." In Ed Brumby and Eric Vaszolyi (eds) Language Problems and Aboriginal Education. Perth: Mount Lawley College of Advanced Education.

Malcolm, Ian G. (1992) "English in the education of speakers of Aboriginal English." In Jeff Siegel (ed) Pidgins, Creoles and Non-standard Dialects in Education. Occasional Paper No. 12. Melbourne: Applied Linguistics Association of Australia.

McConvell, Patrick (1982) "Supporting the two-way school." In Jeanie Bell (ed) Language Planning for Australian Aboriginal Languages. Alice Springs: Institute for Aboriginal Development.

McRae, David, *et al* (1995) Langwij Comes to School. Canberra: Department of Employment, Education and Training.

Sato, Charlene J. (1993) "Language change in a creole continuum: decreolisation?" In Kenneth Hyltenstam and Ake Viberg (eds) Progression and Regression in Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Todd, Loreto (1984) Modern Englishes: Pidgins and Creoles. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Yunupingu, Mandawuy (1990) "Language and power the Yolngu rise to power at Yirrkala School". In Christine Walton and William Eggington (eds) Language: Maintenance, Power and Education in Australian Aboriginal Contexts. Darwin: NTU Press.

APPENDIX

Table 1

Language and Communication Enhancement for Two Way Education
Review of Tasks 1994-1995

Date	Research Team	Participating Teachers	Education Department
February 1994	Formation of research team		Appointment of 2 members to research team
	Preparation of project information sheet		Contacting schools and teachers
March 1994	Selection of 9 schools and 18 teachers		
	Appointment of research assistant (1)		
	Initiation of literature searches		
April 1994	Preparation for data elicitation - individual schedule - group schedule - teacher interviews - Aboriginal adult interviews		
May 1994	Appointment of research assistant (2) (Aboriginal)		
	Data gathering visits to all 9 schools	Observation of data gathering interviews	
	Transcription of tapes		
June 1994	Analysis of linguistic data from schools		
	Development of autonomous learning packages		
	Planning of July inservice course		
July 1994	Inservice course: 1 week's training based on research data Organisation of mentors for participating teachers	Inservice course: 1 week's training based on research data	

Date	Research Team	Participating Teachers	Education Department
August 1994	Development and forwarding of comparative analyses across schools	Progressive work on autonomous work package	
	Determination and forwarding to teachers of work packages (a) Linguistic (b) Educational	Progressive work on linguistic (action research) work package	
	Analysis of teacher and adult Aboriginal interview data	Progressive work on educational (2 way learning) work package	
		Ongoing contact with team mentor	
September 1994	Preparation of unit and course outlines for University approval	(As for August)	
	Determination of evaluation procedures for teachers and project		Initial meeting to establish bidialectal education consultative group
October 1994	Second Inservice visit to schools - tutorials - evaluation	Inservice presentations to research team (some submissions to follow by mail)	Joint inservicing of Aboriginal education specialists with project team
December 1994	Finalisation of evaluation of teacher input and sending out of letters of thanks and credit information		
January 1995	Further assistance with Education Dept. inservice work		Further joint inservice work with team
February 1995	Analysis of evaluation forms	Project evaluation forms due to be returned	
	Appointment of research assistant (3)		Meeting of Project members with Executive Director Student Services on follow up to project
	Progressive drafting of Project Report		
March 1995	Ongoing work on Project Report		Establishment of collaborative team to seek funding for continuation of research

Date Research Team Participating Teachers Education Department

May 1995	Project Report due for completion		Research application for 1996 due for submission
February 1996		Credit may be claimed towards up to 2 units in Graduate Certificate of Arts in Language Studies (Aboriginal) or Graduate Diploma of Arts in Language Studies (Bidialectal Education Major)	

Table 2

INDIVIDUAL INTERVIEW

1. Warm Up

Help the child to feel at ease with any appropriate introductory remarks. then ask:

1.1 You're [name] are you?
1.2 Have you got any brothers and sisters?
1.3 Where do most of your relations come from?
1.4 What do you like most at school?

2. Story

I'd like you to listen to a very short story and then answer some questions about it. Okay? Listen carefully.
(Story on tape: "Two kids were playing when they heard a noise. It was a big goanna. They chased it a long way but it got away.")

Now, here are some questions about the story:

2.1 Who is the story about?
2.2 When did the two kids hear a noise?
2.3 What made the noise?
2.4 What did the kids do?
2.5 What happened to the goanna?

(Play the story again if the child can't recall the answers)

3. Sentence Repetition

Now I'm going to play the tape again and each time you hear someone talk I want you to say after the tape what the person on the tape is saying.

3.1 This is a hot place
3.2 The teacher's car's a Toyota
3.3 If you drop an egg it breaks
3.4 Those boys have gone home
3.5 He gave me a dollar
3.6 Dogs often scratch themselves
3.7 Most books are made of paper
3.8 Why are they always fighting?
3.9 His team came last in the race
3.10 When he'd finished he handed his work in
3.11 There's water in the hole
3.12 Those horses are too tired for work
3.13 All my wishes have come true
3.14 The road goes past the school
3.15 My sister said she saw a ghost
3.16 When we were walking home we found some money
3.17 Can you swim?
3.18 He asked if he could have my pen
3.19 After supper we aren't hungry any more
3.20 Stephen brought his dog to school
3.21 The fruit that he picked are in the basket
3.22 My brother works on a station

4. Closing

That's great
Do you want to ask me anything before you go back to class?

Table 3

PROFILE OF:

	Sounds			Words (Meanings)			Word Formations			Sentence Structures			Other			Stnd. Eng. Output	
	Lne No.	Aborig[Stnd Way Eng. Way]	Ling Ref./ Tally	Lne No.	Aborig(Stnd Way Eng. Way]	Ling Ref./ Tally	Lne No.	Aborig(Stnd Way Eng. Way]	Ling Ref./ Tally	Lne No.	Aborig(Stnd Way Eng. Way]	Ling Ref./ Tally	Lne No.	Aborig(Stnd Way Eng. Way]	Ling Ref./ Tally	Ling. Ref.	Standard Output	Tally
SIMPLFICATION																		
INVENTIONS																		
TRANSFERS																		

Table 4

FRAMEWORK FOR SCHOOL AND CROSS-SCHOOL PROFILES

DATA SOURCE: Indiv (no.) Group (no.) Other	SCHOOL:

FEATURE	SAE	n	AE FORM	n	OTHER AE ALTERNANTS	n
Simplifications						
1.00 Non-occurring forms						
1.1 Verb 3 person singular present (-s)	he eats					
1.2 Verb past tense: regular (-ed)	he waited					
1.3 Verb past tense: irregular (eg come)	he came					
1.4 Verb auxiliary 'have' with perfect	he has come					
1.5 Verb auxiliary 'have' with past perfect	he had come					
1.6 Verb auxiliary 'be' with present continuous	he [i]s coming					
1.7 Verb auxiliary 'be' with past continuous	he was coming					
1.8 Verb auxiliary 'be' with passive (present)	it [i]s taken					
1.8.1 Verb auxiliary 'be' with passive (past)	it was taken					
1.9Verb copula 'be' with 'there'	There is/was					

23

(Simplifications - contd.)	SCHOOL:			
FEATURE	**SAE**	**n**	**AE FORM**	**n**	**OTHER AE ALTERNANTS**	**n**
2.0 Non-occurring functions						
2.1 Differentiation of past tense from past participle	we saw/we have seen		we seen			
2.2 Subject-verb agreement in plural auxiliary	we were going		we was goin(g)			
3.0 Syntactic reduction						
3.1 'YES/NO' questions with 'be' or modals	Can I go now?		I can go now?			
3.2 WH questions	Where are you going?		Where you goin(g)?			
3.3 DO questions	Do you want it?		You want it?			

SCHOOL

FEATURE Nativization	SAE EQUIVALENT n	AE FORM n	OTHER AE ALTERNANTS n
5.0 New Forms			
5.1 Verb: invariant past/completion marker 'bin'	see 1.2, 1.3		
5.2 Verb: invariant question forming tag, eg. 'ana'	isn't it? don't you? (etc)		
5.3 Verb: invariant negator 'nothing'	is/does not		
5.4 Pronoun: personal invariant 3 pers. sing. 'e'	he/she/it		
5.4.1 Personal invariant 3 per s/pl im	it, they		
5.5 Pronoun: analytical possessive 'he's', 'e's'	his (her/its)		
5.6 Pronoun: non-analytical possessive			
Stephen for car	Stephen's car		
5.7 Pronoun: reflexive	Themselves		
5.8 Phonological reconstruction ('aksed', 'its mean')	Asked, it means		

Table 5

LANGUAGE AND COMMUNICATION ENHANCEMENT FOR TWO WAY EDUCATION : IN SERVICE COURSE PLAN

		MONDAY 18 JULY	TUESDAY 19 JULY	WEDNESDAY 20 JULY	THURSDAY 21 JULY	FRIDAY 22 JULY
		ABORIGINAL ENGLISH	USING ABORIGINAL ENGLISH	ABORIGINAL LEARNING	TWO WAY LEARNING	TWO WAY EDUCATION
9.00 -	1	What is Ab1 E? - Features - Development IM	Ab1 E and English -Distinguishing dialect features from mistakes -Problem of "transparency" IM	Traditional Aboriginal Learning SF	Retrospective GP	Two Ways of Doing Creative Arts SF
10.00	2	What is A1 E Like in My School? - Survey Results Team	Ab E and Ab Langs TM	Two-Way Learning & Bilingual Ed TM	Ab Ed History & Policy TM PK YH	Two Ways of Evaluating Learning GP
11.00	3	Case Studies A detailed look at the English of one child 5 Groups	Ab1 E & Speech Use and Classroom Discourse - What Goes Wrong and Why? IM	Experiences of Aboriginal Learners SF SH	Language class ESL strategies (workshop) YH PK	Working with Mixed Groups PK YH
12.00	4	What Does Ab1 E Show us About Thinking? IM	Ab1 E and Writing IM	Teaching & Learning with Minority Group Learners GP	Jigsaw 4 curriculum areas GP YH	Media in Aboriginal Education Development of Objectives & Curricula for Term 3
2-3.30	5	Gathering Data on Ab1 E in My School Workshop Team	Analysing Ab1 E Data in My School Workshop IM	Looking at Curriculum the Aboriginal Way Workshop GP	Role Play Workshop GP	Development of Objectives & Curricula for Term 3 Workshop Team

IM Professor Ian Malcolm
TM Dr Toby Metcalfe
SF Simon Forrest
GP Dr Gary Partington
PK Patricia Konigsberg
YH Yvonne Haig

Team: IM, TM, SP, GP, PK, YK plus Aileen Hawkes, Paul O'Malley, Alison Hill

Table 6

LANGUAGE AND COMMUNICATION ENHANCEMENT FOR TWO-WAY EDUCATION

Linguistic Work Package

Aims

1. To give you experience in eliciting, recording, transcribing and linguistically analysing oral and written language data from children in your class or School.

2. To provide you with fuller information on Aboriginal English in your school as an input to two way curriculum development.

3. Optionally, to enable you to understand the English of Aboriginal pupils in the light of how it varies from that of non-Aboriginal pupils and/or Aboriginal adults.

Tasks

A. Oral Language

1. Select (with appropriate permission) up to four individual Aboriginal children whose use of English you wish to investigate.

2. Using the form and procedures demonstrated by the research team, record an "individual interview" with the selected children.

3. Using the procedures demonstrated by the research team record group interactions of a duration of up to 1 hour.

4. Optionally, record free speech of the children as appropriate opportunities arise.

5. Transcribe the material recorded.

6. Analyse the speech recorded according to the system learnt in the Inservice Course.

7. Produce
   a) individual profiles for each child selected, on the individual analysis sheets
   b) a school profile on the school framework sheet.

8. Compare your findings
   a) from child to child
   b) (optionally) between Aboriginal children and non-Aboriginal children or Aboriginal adults

c) with the findings obtained by the team.

9. Interpret your findings

B Classroom Interaction

1. Record interactional sequences in one or more lessons involving Aboriginal pupils

2. Transcribe the recording into separate speech acts (i.e. functional units)

3. Report on how
   a) the Aboriginal pupils
   b) you
   participate in the interaction

4. Suggest how the interaction could have been improved.

C Written Language

Set some writing by your Aboriginal children in at least two different genres. Analyse the writing to show

a) dialect features
b) errors
c) characteristics of the genre

Reporting

Prepare a comprehensive report on all of this for presentation in a 1 hour session at the in-service course in October. The work should be completed by 21 October together with handouts or transparencies for use in the group presentation.

Table 7

LANGUAGE AND COMMUNICATION ENHANCEMENT FOR TWO-WAY EDUCATION

Two-Way Learning Work Package

Aims

1. To apply knowledge of Aboriginal English to the ways in which interaction and learning take place, for Aboriginal English speakers, in classrooms

2. To develop procedures to ensure the acceptance of Aboriginal English as part of the repertoire of its speakers and the exploitation of the Aboriginal ways of structuring experience, which it represents, to benefit the school learning of speakers of Aboriginal English

3. To develop procedures to assist Aboriginal English speakers in acquiring competence in standard Australian English where appropriate.

Tasks

1. Choose a particular curriculum area and/or a particular class and develop strategies for two-way learning, which will encompass

   a) Acceptance of AE
   b) Briding Between SAE and AE
   c) Cultivating Aboriginal Ways of Approaching Experience and Learning

2. Keep a diary for at least 4 weeks recording how you have implemented the above strategies and what the effects have been on you and the children.

3. Record a short portion of a lesson in which strategies for two-way learning are being employed and analyse the interaction.

4. Take one curriculum area and show how you would modify your programming in it over a given period (not more than one month) to make the learning two-way.

Reporting

Prepare a comprehensive report on all of this for presentation in a 1 hour session at the in-service course in October. The work should be completed by 21 October together with handouts or transparencies for use in the group presentation.